

REMARKS

The Office Action dated December 15, 2008 was received and carefully reviewed.

By this response, claims 19, 24, 25, and 29 are hereby amended to clarify the invention, and not for reasons of patentability. Claims 1-18 remain withdrawn for being directed to a non-elected invention. New claims 30-35 have been added by this reply, and do not include new matter. Accordingly, claims 1-35 are currently pending in the subject application.

Support for the amendments to claims 19 and 25 can be found at least on page 18, line 8 to page 19, line 3, as well as page 21, lines 6-24, and FIGS. 1B, 1C, 6D, 6E, 20B, 20C, 23D, and 23E of the present application. Support for the features recited in new claims 30 and 31 can be seen at least on page 6, lines 8-24 of the present application. Thus, no new matter is included in the amendments to claims 1-3, or in newly added claim 30.

Reconsideration and allowance of the subject application is hereby requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

Specification

The title of the invention has been amended as seen above. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the objection.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 19-21, 23, 25, 26, and 28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Suzuki et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,952,036 B2) (*Suzuki*, hereafter). Applicants traverse this rejection for at least the reasons set forth below.

Applicants respectfully submit that present independent claims 19 and 25, and the claims dependent therefrom, are patently distinguishable over *Suzuki*, since *Suzuki* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest all of the features recited in the pending claims. For example, independent claim 19 (emphasis added) recites:

19. A method for manufacturing a semiconductor device comprising the steps of:

SEMICONDUCTOR INTEGRATED CIRCUIT INCLUDING OSCILLATOR
AND SEMICONDUCTOR INTEGRATED CIRCUIT FOR COMMUNICATION

BACKGROUND OF THE INVENTION

The present invention relates to the technology which can be effectively applied to a VCO (Voltage-Controlled Oscillation circuit) which can adjust an oscillation frequency and more particularly to the technology which can also be effectively applied to the VCO mounted to a semiconductor integrated circuit for communication for making communication, for example, with a semiconductor chip for an electronic tag having a radio communication function which is generally called a radio tag.

In a device for radio communication such as a semiconductor integrated circuit for high frequency used for modulation of transmitting signal and demodulation of receiving signal used for radio tag and mobile telephone, a PLL (Phase Locked Loop) circuit including a VCO to generate an oscillation signal of the predetermined frequency to be mixed with a receiving signal and a transmitting signal has been used.

The VCO used for such radio communication is always required to oscillate within the predetermined frequency but the oscillation frequency thereof is often deviated from the predetermined frequency range due to the manufacturing fluctuation. Therefore, the

frequency of each VCO has been measured with the probe inspection and a capacitance value of the capacitance element forming the VCO has been adjusted with the trimming using a laser for the purpose of frequency matching. However, the adjustment method utilizing the trimming has a problem that the manufacturing cost rises.

On the other hand, as the PLL circuit which can automatically adjust the self-running frequency, there is proposed the invention (for example, see to the patent document 1) where a comparing circuit for comparing the control voltage supplied to the VCO from a loop filter with the reference voltage and a circuit for generating a trimming data based on the comparison result of such comparing circuit are provided.

[Patent document 1]

Japanese Published Unexamined Patent Application
No. Hei 7(1995)-46123

SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION

However, in the prior art invention, the oscillation frequency of VCO may be adjusted by varying a current flowing into the VCO depending on a trimming data. Therefore, in the system where the oscillation frequency of VCO is adjusted by varying a current like the prior art document, there is a problem that fluctuation of current consumption becomes too large.

by a droplet discharge method as seen in FIG. 6D, whereby any extra droplets 76 adhering to the mask 73, are removed when along with the mask 73 (see the present application, e.g., page 24, lns. 1-2). Thus, the wiring pattern left 75 is does not have any extra droplets 76.

The Examiner purports that “Suzuki et al. further discloses removing the mask; performing a planarization processing (col. 9, lines 28-30) to an upper surface of the embedded wiring; forming a gate insulating film (47)(col. 9, line 67) over the embedded wiring; and forming a semiconductor film (active layer (50), which is the same as the active layer (17)(col. 5, lines 56-57)) over the gate insulating film” (see the Office Action, e.g., pages 2 and 3). However, *Suzuki* is completely silent with regard to removing the mask after the step of forming the embedded wiring, as recited in present independent claims 19 and 25.

For at least the reasons stated above, *Suzuki* neither anticipates nor renders obvious all of the features of the invention as presently claimed. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of independent claims 19 and 25.

Further, claims 20, 21, 23, 24, and 26-28 are allowable at least by virtue of their dependency from one of the independent claims, but also because they are distinguishable over the prior art. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection, and the allowance of these claims.

In addition, new claims 30-35 are distinguishable over the prior art. Accordingly, the allowance of these claims is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 22 and 27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Suzuki* in view of Itagaki et al. (U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2001/0029066 A1) (*Itagaki*, hereinafter). Claims 24 and 29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Suzuki* in view of Yamazaki et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,176,069 B2) (*Yamazaki*, hereinafter). Applicants traverse these rejections for at least the reasons set forth below.

Applicants contend that neither *Itagaki* nor *Yamazaki* make up for the deficiencies of

Suzuki. Thus, claims 22, 24, 27, and 29 are allowable at least by virtue of its dependency to one of the independent claims, but also because it is distinguishable over the prior art. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of the claim.

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is respectfully requested. If, however, the Examiner deems that any issue remains after considering this response, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney/agent to expedite the prosecution and engage in a joint effort to work out a mutually satisfactory solution.

Except for issue fees payable under 37 C.F.R. § 1.18, the Commissioner is hereby authorized by this paper to charge any additional fees during the entire pendency of this application including fees due under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 and 1.17 which may be required, including any required extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-2380. This paragraph is intended to be a **CONSTRUCTIVE PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME** in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a)(3).

Respectfully submitted,
NIXON PEABODY LLP

Date: March 16, 2009 /Anthony J. Canning, Reg. #62,107/
Anthony J. Canning
Registration No. 62,107

NIXON PEABODY LLP
Customer No. 22204
Suite 900,
401 9th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004-2128
(202) 585-8000